

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 40-59 were pending in the application, of which Claims 40 and 50 are independent. In the Office Action dated October 19, 2005, Claims 40-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 40-59 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated October 19, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 40, 45-48, 50, and 55-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,361,361 ("*Hickman*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,380,957 ("*Banning*"). Claims 40 and 50 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 15, lines 17-20.

Amended Claim 40 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "a first level of categories in the unified taxonomy structure being predefined, static, and used by all the different vendors of software and hardware components installed on the computer." Amended Claim 50 includes a similar recitation.

In contrast, and as stated by the Examiner, *Hickman* at least does not teach or suggest a static first level of categories within the unified taxonomy structure. (See Office Action, page 6, 7-10.) Consequently, *Hickman* does not teach or suggest a static first level of categories in a unified taxonomy structure that is predefined and used by all different vendors of software and hardware components installed on a computer.

Furthermore, *Banning* does not overcome *Hickman*'s deficiencies. *Banning* merely discloses that a typical GUI may display a directory tree 10 within a pane 12 of a larger window area 14. (See col. 1, lines 60-62, FIGs. 1A-1D.) In *Banning*, pane 12 is on the left side of window 14, while the right side contains another pane 16 which is used to display logical file system objects that reside in a particular device or directory that has been selected in pane 12. (See col. 1, lines 62-65, FIGs. 1A-1D.) In *Banning*, however, neither pane 12 nor pane 14 discloses that a first level of categories are used by all different vendors of software and hardware components installed on the computer of *Banning*. Consequently, like *Hickman*, *Banning* at least does not teach or suggest a static first level of categories in a unified taxonomy structure that is predefined and used by all different vendors of software and hardware components installed on a computer.

Combining *Hickman* with *Banning* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Hickman* and *Banning*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "a first level of categories in the unified taxonomy structure being predefined, static, and used by all the different vendors of software and hardware

components installed on the computer”, as recited by amended Claim 40. Amended Claim 50 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 40 and 50 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 40 and 50.

Dependent Claims 41-49 and 51-59 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 40 and 50, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 40 and 50. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 41-49 and 51-59.

II. Conclusion


In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 19, 2006

By: _____


D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

Merchant & Gould
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-9946
Telephone: 404.954.5066



DKS:mdb